



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,394	12/05/2005	Goran Hansson	37950	8636
116 7590 06/24/2008 PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			EXAMINER RO, BENTSU	
			ART UNIT 2837	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,394

Applicant(s)

HANSSON ET AL.

Examiner

/BENTSU RO/

Art Unit

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-7, 9-11, 16-19 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 12-15, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2005-03-11
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

**FIRST OFFICE ACTION ----- A NONFINAL REJECTION**

1. Claims 5-7, 9-11, 16-19 and 22 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

2. Drawing corrections are required as follows:

- In Figs. 1 and 2, label box 4 as "antenna".
- In Fig. 2, the box 50 is believed to be a microprocessor. See specification page 11, line 31. However, the reference numeral "50" has also been used as an "automatic door", see specification page 12, line 7. A single reference numeral cannot simultaneously be used to represent two different elements. Therefore, one of the reference numerals "50" should be changed. When so doing, the specification should also be amended accordingly.
- In Fig. 4, a leading line that connects the reference numeral "78" to the isolating material is missing.
- In Fig. 5, label the box 66 as a "detecting circuit".
- In Fig. 8, label the box 104 as "oscillator"; box 106 as "bandpass filter"; box 112 as "detecting unit"; etc.

If the box is too small, the legend can be placed outside the box.

Art Unit: 2837

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-4, 13, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims are rejected because of insufficient antecedent basis or inconsistent terminology. See the following explanations:

- Claim 1, line 3 recites "which circuit". However, prior to that, no circuit has been defined. Thus, the "which circuit" refers to which unit is unclear.
- Claim 1, line 6 recites "said detecting circuit". However, line 3 defines "a detecting unit", not "a detecting circuit". Thus, the "detecting circuit" of line 6 is inconsistent with the "detecting unit" of line 3.
- Claim 1, last line recites "said protection field". However, line 2 defines "a protecting area", not "a protecting field".
- Claim 2, line 3, the recitation "which circuit" has the same problem as that of claim 1, line 3, the "which circuit".
- Claim 2, line 7, the recitation "said detecting circuit" (two occurrences) is inconsistent with line 3, the defined "a detecting unit".
- Claim 3, lines 1-2, the phrase "according to claim 1 or 2 in combination with claim 1" is unclear. Is claim 3 depending on claim 1 or depending on claim 2 or depending on claims 1 and 2 ???

- Claim 3, lines 2-3, the recitation "said means of the detecting circuit" is unclear.
- Claim 4, line 3, the recitation "said detecting circuit" is inconsistent with claims 1 and 2, the defined phrase "a detecting unit".
- Claim 13, line 4 defines "a detecting circuit". However, line 13 recites the "detecting circuit" as "the detecting unit". Thus, the recitations on lines 4 and 13 are inconsistent.
- Claim 20, line 9, the recitation "said housing" lacks antecedent basis.
- Claim 21, line 6, after the words "characterised in" delete one of the "that said".
- Claim 21, line 10, the recitation "said housing" lacks antecedent basis.
- Claim 21, line 17, the recitation "the detecting unit" is inconsistent with line 3 the defined "a detecting circuit".

5. Claims 1-4, 8, 12-15, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims are rejected because some of the claimed elements are un-identifiable. For example, in claim 1, the "means connected to said antenna unit arranged to detect a variation of the pressure at said antenna unit cause by compressive force" and the "detecting means for detecting small variations in the generated electric or electromagnetic field at the antenna unit" are indifferentiable. It is noted that the detecting means for detecting small variations in the generated electric or electromagnetic field at the antenna unit reads onto Fig. 1 or Fig. 2. See

specification page 14, lines 9-11. If this is true, then the "means connected to said antenna unit arranged to detect a variation of the pressure at said antenna unit caused by compressive force" read onto which element is unclear.

The "generating means" for generating an electric or electromagnetic field antenna unit" is unclear because the antenna generates electric or electromagnetic field. The "generating means" should read onto the square wave signal generator 6 of Fig. 1. Yet, the square wave signal generator 6 does not generate electric or electromagnetic field. The "balancing means" is unclear. Which element reads onto the balancing means is unclear. The "indication means" is not shown in any of the drawings.

In order to assist the examiner, all claimed elements in the independent claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 20, 21 should be identified with the disclosed elements so that the examiner can make a thorough search of the prior art.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to /BENTSU RO/ at telephone number (571)272-2072.

/BENTSU RO/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2837